

Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum

23

Daniel R. Schwartz

Agrippa I



Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum

herausgegeben von
Martin Hengel und Peter Schäfer

23

Agrippa I

The Last King of Judaea

by

Daniel R. Schwartz



J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen

CIP-Titelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

Schwartz, Daniel R.:

Agrippa I [the First] : the last king of Judaea / by Daniel R. Schwartz. –
Tübingen : Mohr, 1990

(Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum ; 23)

ISBN 3-16-145341-7

ISSN 0721-8753

NE: GT

978-3-16-158774-0 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019

© 1990 J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), P.O. Box 2040, D-7400 Tübingen.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Computersatz Staiger in Ammerbuch-Pfäffingen using Times typeface, printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging stock paper from Papierfabrik Buhl in Ettlingen and bound by Heinr. Koch in Tübingen.

Printed in Germany.

To the Memories
of my father, Abraham G. Schwartz,
and
of my teacher, Professor Menahem Stern

Table of Contents

Foreword	XI
List of Abbreviations	XVII
Chapter I: Josephus on Agrippa	1
I. The First Chapter (<i>Ant.</i> 18.126–255)	2
II. The Last Chapter (<i>Ant.</i> 19.292–366)	11
III. The Second Chapter (<i>Ant.</i> 18.256–309)	18
IV. The Third Chapter (<i>Ant.</i> 19.1–277)	23
V. <i>Ant.</i> 19.278–291	30
VI. Josephus' Sources on Agrippa I: Observations and Conclusions	31
Table of Josephus' Sources on Agrippa	38
Chapter II: From Boyhood to his Uncles' Heir	39
I. Young Agrippa in Rome	39
II. Poor Agrippa in Judaea	45
III. Tiberius' Death and Gaius' Succession to the Throne: The First Third	53
IV. The Next Third	55
1. Chronology and Agrippa's Whereabouts	57
2. Agrippa's Accusations Against Antipas	58
3. Agrippa's Status, Titles and Territories	59
4. Judaea Under Gaius	62

Chapter III: Agrippa Under Gaius Caligula	67
I. Agrippa in Judaea under Gaius	67
II. Agrippa and Alexandria, 38 C.E.	74
III. Gaius' Attempt to Erect his Statue in the Temple of Jerusalem	77
 Chapter IV:	
Agrippa, Claudius and the Jews of the Diaspora	90
I. Agrippa and Claudius' Accession to the Throne	91
II. Diasporan Jewry in 41 C.E.	93
1. The Expulsion of the Jews of Rome	94
2. The "Trial" of Agrippa and some Alexandrian Anti-Semites	96
3. Claudius, Agrippa and the Alexandrian "Jewish Question" .	99
 Chapter V: Agrippa I, King of Judaea	107
I. Chronological Limits	107
II. Geographical Limits	111
III. Administration of the Kingdom	112
IV. Agrippa's Policies	116
1. Agrippa and the Jews of his Kingdom: The Sects	116
a) The Burning of a Priest's Daughter	118
b) Persecution of the Christian Church	119
c) Simon's Call to Exclude Agrippa from the Temple . . .	124
2. Agrippa and the Gentile World	130
3. Agrippa and the Roman Empire	134
a) The Tiberian Conclave	137
b) The Third Wall	140

Chapter VI:

Agrippa’s Death, Aftermath and Place in History 145

 I. Agrippa’s Death 145

 II. After Agrippa: The Roman View 149

 III. Agrippa and the Development of the Early Church 153

 IV. Agrippa and the Jewish People: Rabbinic Literature 157

 V. A Historian’s View of Agrippa 171

Appendices 176

 I. Source-Critical Arguments from Vocabulary 176

 II. When was L. Pomponius Flaccus Governor of Syria? 183

 III. Simon Cantheras and the Boethus Family 185

 IV. Caiaphas and Cantheras (by Dr. Robert Brody) 190

 V. On the Chronology of the Legation to Gaius 196

 VI. The Philonic Authorship of Agrippa’s Epistle
 to Gaius (*Leg.* 276–329) 200

 VII. More on the Date of Agrippa’s Death 203

 VIII. How Many Apostles did Agrippa Kill? 208

 IX. Structure and Chronology in the Acts of the Apostles 213

 X. Agrippa’s Death: A Medical Point of View 217

 XI. Agrippa’s Descent and Jewish Law 219

Indices 223

 I. Names, Subjects and Ancient Sources 223

 II. Authors Cited 229

Foreword

The Hebrew original of this book was, apparently, the first published volume ever devoted to Agrippa I.¹ There are, it is true, a few detailed studies of this king, especially of the final, royal, chapter of his life,² and this colorful figure of the first century has also been the subject of various essays.³ Nevertheless, in light of the numerous detailed monographs about Herod the Great (Agrippa's grandfather and immediate predecessor as king of Judaea) and some of Agrippa's contemporaries, such as Pontius Pilate and Herod Antipas, not to mention the founding figures of Christianity, it is surprising that this overcrowded field of scholarship has not produced a full-length study of the king whose reign was "the last golden age of the Jews in antiquity . . . the most determined effort . . . to settle the differences between the Roman empire and Judaism."⁴ It is surely worthwhile to study what went wrong, and what went

¹ I emphasize "published," so as to leave room for a mimeographed monograph by W. Wirgin, entitled "Herod Agrippa I: King of the Jews," Parts 1–2 (1968), presented to the members of the Leeds University Oriental Society, according to the cover of the sixth (1966–68) volume of the Society's *Annual*. For some comments on this study, see L. H. Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980)* (1984), pp. 326, 928. Apart from this work, I have noticed only one other volume on Agrippa, a historical novel on the period prior to Tiberius' death: J. G. Swan, *Herod Agrippa: A Tale of Palestine and the Roman Empire* (1951).

² Note, especially, E. Ciaceri, "Agrippa I° e la politica di Roma verso la Giudea," *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 76/2 (1916/17), pp. 687–724, reprinted in in idem, *Processi politici e relazioni internazionali* (1918), pp. 319–362, also M. Stern, "The Reign of Agrippa I," in *Vehinei Ain Yossef: Collected Studies in Memory of Joseph Amorai* (1973), pp. 117–135 (in Hebrew).

³ Apart from the chapters in every history of the period, of which the most recent detailed ones are *SVM I*, pp. 442–454, Smallwood, *Jews*, pp. 187–200, and M. Stern, in *The Herodian Period* (World History of the Jewish People 1/7, edd. M. Avi-Yonah and Z. Baras; 1975), pp. 139–149, two essays are especially noteworthy: E. Jaccard, in *La liberté chrétienne* 9 (1906), cols. 65–81, and M. P. Charlesworth, *Five Men: Character Studies from the Roman Empire* (1936), pp. 3–30.

⁴ Stern (above, n. 3), p. 139.

right, with this effort – which was followed by a reinstatement of direct Roman rule and, within a generation, by the destruction of the Second Temple (70 C.E.), the last vestige of Jewish territorialism. Moreover, Agrippa became king of Judaea immediately upon the death of Gaius Caligula (in January of 41 C.E.), whose attempt to erect a statue in the Temple would probably have brought on the rebellion and the destruction of the Temple, had he not been assassinated in the nick of time. In other words, Agrippa's reign was not only a short interlude of glory. It also constituted a complete turnabout in Roman-Jewish relations, a last-ditch effort to avert catastrophe.

Again, Agrippa's reign played a pivotal role in the development of early Christianity: his persecution of the Church, reported in Acts 12, functions in that book as the watershed between a primarily Judaeian and Jewish Church and one which increasingly turned abroad and to Gentiles.

Finally, Agrippa's career was intermeshed with the vicissitudes of the Jews of the Hellenistic-Roman Diaspora in his day, particularly Alexandrian Jewry, where what is usually considered the first pogrom in history, with terrible consequences, was touched off by Agrippa's visit to the city in 38 C.E. Correspondingly, Agrippa was to be, more or less *ex officio*, the Diaspora's primary advocate in Rome. Given the fact that the Hellenistic Diaspora, which had enjoyed a generally peaceful and creative existence for centuries since Alexander, was to begin around Agrippa's day a series of tribulations which ended in its virtual destruction and oblivion under Trajan, this point of view too is especially meaningful. But the Jews of Rome, where Agrippa was brought up, were spared those difficulties, for the most part, and went on living a peaceful existence for centuries. This contrast too, which Agrippa himself illustrates and in which he may have played a role, is another topic worthy of study.

In brief, Agrippa I is a relatively well-documented figure who played a central role in the decade which saw the birth of Christianity, the first pogrom in history, and an ominous clash in Judaea between the Jews and Rome which was something of a dress rehearsal for the destruction of the Temple a generation later. But he himself pursued a lifestyle which was highly successful in the Roman Empire. It is hoped that the present study of this monarch will at least begin to do justice to his significance from the point of view of these epoch-making developments.

It should be admitted, however, that this monograph was not born out of an interest in Agrippa, although that was never absent and grew as the work progressed. Rather, it grew out of an interest in Josephus, the first-century Jewish historian who supplies us with virtually all we know about Agrippa (and Judaeian history of the period in general). In particular, it was born as a response to three of the foremost abovementioned modern monographs on Herod, Herod Antipas and Pontius Pilate, who are similarly known almost

exclusively from the pages of Josephus.⁵ On the one hand, these works impressed me by their usefulness. Such detailed compendia of all that one might want to know about such central personalities and their times are frequently the best sources of information on the period, since many ancient sources focus on “great men.” On the other hand, however, all three of these works, in line with the general fashion of Josephan scholarship in recent decades, devote virtually no attention to the questions of Josephus’ sources.⁶ What did Josephus have on his table when writing his account? How did he treat his sources? Did he rewrite, or did he cut and paste? What guided him? Did he succeed in properly combining them? Did he, for example, always realize when two different sources discussed the same event, or did he sometimes fail to do so, thus turning one event into two? Conversely, did he at times take two sources relating to different events as if they referred to the same one? And what about points of view? Did Josephus change the points of views of his sources, or did he leave them as he found them? May we, that is, assume that the attitudes expressed in Josephus’ account are his own, and should we therefore evaluate them according to what we know of Josephus’ social background, career and the like? Or is his historiography rather a compilation which, if properly analyzed, may reflect as many points of view as Josephus had sources?

These questions were the bread and butter of Josephan scholarship until the early twentieth century. From our point of view, the best example is W. Otto’s 1913 study of Herod.⁷ But they went out of style, for various reasons, in favor of a *kompositionskritische* point of view which assumes that Josephus was an author, and that his work’s prehistory is probably unrecoverable and in any event uninteresting.⁸ In my own work, however, I have found the earlier approach frequently convincing and useful; that is, it solves problems which other approaches cannot. (To the extent *Kompositionskritik* goes hand in hand with a lack of interest in the truth of the events Josephus nar-

⁵ I refer to A. Schalit, *König Herodes: Der Mann und sein Werk* (1969; Hebrew original in 1960); H. W. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas* (1972); and J.-P. Lémonon, *Pilate et le gouvernement de la Judée: Textes et monuments* (1981). For my comments on Lémonon’s volume, see *IEJ* 33 (1983), pp. 146–148.

⁶ For a review of trends in modern Josephan scholarship, see P. Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, his Works, and their Importance* (1988), chapter 4. My review of the same subject forms part of “Texts, Coins, Fashions and Dates: Josephus’ Vita and Agrippa II’s Death,” to be published in *Studies*.

⁷ W. Otto, *Herodes: Beiträge zur Geschichte eines jüdischen Königshauses* (1913); this detailed study appeared originally, with slightly different pagination, in *PWRE Supplementband 2* (1913).

⁸ For a discussion of the excesses to which such a point of view may lead, see my “On Abraham Schalit, Herod, Josephus, the Holocaust, Horst R. Moehring, and the Study of Ancient Jewish History,” *Jewish History* 2/2 (Fall 1987), esp. pp. 19–21.

rates, that inability will not bother many of its advocates.) Lately, moreover, there are some indications that the pendulum of fashion might be swinging back.⁹ Be that as it may, the decision to write a monograph on Agrippa flowed from a desire to test the source-critical approach on a large section of Josephus' *Antiquities*, to see if here, as in many smaller sections, it would result in a more reliable appreciation of "what really happened." Not surprisingly, I found the test yielded positive results. Readers are invited, of course, to make their own judgements.

I hasten to add two clarifications. The first is that I do not consider this approach to Josephus one which belittles him, turning him into "merely a compiler." The efforts involved in compiling – extracting, assembling, coordinating and linking – are worthy of appreciation, not belittlement. Moreover, if this was the task Josephus set for himself, then neither he, nor his modern advocates, should mind his work being treated as such. Indeed, in my mind, although again in contrast to recent fashion, Josephus' historiography is frequently to be preferred to that of his main Jewish colleague, Philo, and that precisely because Philo wrote his own material instead of compiling others'.¹⁰

The second clarification is a disclaimer. This volume contains many suggestions and conclusions regarding Josephus' sources and other matters which we cannot prove with mathematical certainty. This, however, comes with the territory. No one doing ancient history can frequently claim such certainty. The alternative is not to do history at all, and, indeed, some Josephus scholars call for just that, claiming that Josephus should be used only as evi-

⁹ Bilde (above, n. 6), pp. 150–171 demonstrates and bemoans the fact that what he terms the "classical" attitude toward Josephus, which frequently views him as a compiler rather than as an author, was still alive and well during the years 1980–1984, the last years he surveyed. Frequently, he notes, recent scholars have returned to the approaches of nineteenth-century *Quellenkritiker*, something which, in the case of one of my own *Vorarbeiten*, he finds "alarming" (p. 164). For two more recent articles in the same direction, see S. Schwartz, *HTR* 79 (1986), pp. 373–386, and F.G. Downing, *JBL* 107 (1988), pp. 69–85, esp. 74–76; some of my own contributions are mentioned elsewhere in this volume, and the ones originally published in Hebrew will appear together in *Studies*. For a major contribution in this direction from elsewhere in the study of Greco-Roman historiography, see J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia* (1981), chapter 2. Her understanding of Diodorus Siculus' dependence upon his sources is virtually identical to that we find in Josephus in the latter half of the *Antiquities*, which will concern us in this study. (It should be noted that most of the major recent works which emphasize Josephus' authorial involvement in his work, as theologian, Hellenizer, or the like, focus on the first, biblical, half of *Ant*. As a glance at the Septuagint will show, Josephus' sources for that part of his history, even when they were in Greek, required much more rewriting in order to be presentable to the Greco-Roman world than did the material which he seems to have had available for the Herodian period.)

¹⁰ For a recent statement of the current view, see E. M. Smallwood, in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity* (edd. L.H. Feldman and G. Hata; 1987), pp. 114–129. For the opposite view, see P. Bilde, *Studia Theologica* 32 (1978), pp. 67–93, also below, Chapter III, n. 35.

dence for himself.¹¹ In my opinion, such solipsism is unnecessary with regard to such a well-documented topic as ours. It is my conviction that the analysis and conclusions offered in this volume are the most reasonable statements which may be made on the subject today, and that they are convincing enough to be worth the writing and the reading. Reviewers will certainly announce their opinions. In any case, I am sure that I will be spared the type of criticism the late A. Momigliano once brought against another young scholar in a related field, namely, that he lacked the courage to be wrong, which is, at times, also the courage to be right.¹²

The moment I knew a book would result came one dark night five years ago, when I came across the sudden switch from the Greek “Dicaearcheia” to the Latin “Puteoli,” for the same city, in *Ant.* 18.160–161, a switch accompanied by a change in focus: “on the one hand, Cypros . . . and Agrippa, on the other hand . . .” The implications for Josephus’ sources, at first only as a working hypothesis, started off the work which resulted in this volume. The Hebrew original was completed in the spring of 1987 and published in September of that year. Since then, my work on Josephus and related topics has progressed, and that has made its impact upon this book, as have comments from friends and colleagues and in the few reviews which appeared. Moreover, several older publications have since come to my attention or become accessible, and a few relevant new ones have also appeared. It is especially gratifying to see that D. Goodblatt’s essay on the rabbinic material on Agrippa comes independently to several of the same conclusions.¹³ However, while I have done my best to bring this work up to date, it must be taken for granted, given the great quantities of material published annually on this period, and given the time-lag before it is all available and indexed, that I have missed various new pieces.

In revising the Hebrew original of this monograph, I have made an effort to replace references to Hebrew bibliography with references to translations or comparable works, when possible. Biblical verses are usually cited according to the Revised Standard Version.

I owe thanks to many individuals. First and foremost, to the late Professor Menahem Stern, who faithfully and unsparingly guided me in all my studies and work and who took a special interest in this volume. His brutal murder

¹¹ See above, n. 8. For another statement of the point of view criticized in the article mentioned there, but one which (*mirabile dictu!*) allows historians to go on using Josephus’ evidence concerning the topics he discussed, see the final chapter (“On the Use of Josephus”) in Bilde (above, n. 6).

¹² A. Momigliano, *Classical Review* 57 (1943), p. 74 = *Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, II (1975), p. 927.

¹³ D. Goodblatt, “Agrippa I and Palestinian Judaism in the First Century,” *Jewish History* 2/1 (Spring 1987), pp. 7–32.

has robbed the world of an incomparable scholar, and all who knew him of an irreplaceable advisor and friend.

Thanks are also due to Professor Uriel Rappaport of Haifa University, who published two detailed Hebrew reviews of the volume's original¹⁴ and also honored me by his participation in a public debate about the book in Jerusalem last year. Professor Aryeh Kasher of Tel-Aviv University also participated in that debate, and should be thanked accordingly. Professors Louis H. Feldman (Yeshiva University) and Ya'akov Meshorer (Hebrew University) patiently answered various inquiries in their fields of expertise, as did Robert Brody, Paul Mandel, David Satran and Peretz Segal of Hebrew University. Dr. Brody was also kind enough to supply Appendix IV, and another Jerusalem friend, Dr. Samuel Adler, M.D., contributed his expert knowledge for Appendix X. Finally, Dr. Brody and his wife Ziporah also took the time to read the draft of this English version, and made many corrections and improvements. My heartfelt thanks are due to all of these mentors and friends. Of course, however, no one should misuse the fact that I mention them as an excuse to blame them for anything wrong with this book; all decisions and responsibility are my own.

Finally, thanks are due to Professors Martin Hengel (Tübingen) and Peter Schäfer (Berlin), who invited me to prepare this English edition for their series *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum*, and to the staff of the J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, which devoted every effort to preparing the volume suitably. In the near future, the same publisher is to publish a volume of my *Studies on the Jewish Background of the Christianity* in its series *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*. Several of the studies in that volume, whether new or previously published in Hebrew, support arguments in this monograph and are cited in the relevant footnotes.

The Hebrew original of this volume was dedicated to the memory of my mother and my wife's mother, who had always encouraged me and had looked forward to its completion; both succumbed to cancer before it was published. Now, to my sorrow, I have a new pair of memories to which to dedicate this English version. My father died suddenly the week before the Hebrew edition appeared, and now Professor Stern has been snatched away as well. I hope the present volume is a worthy memorial.

Jerusalem, June 1989

D. R. S.

¹⁴ In the weekend supplement of *Haaretz*, Jan. 1, 1988, and in *Zion* 53 (1987/88), pp. 217–223.

Abbreviations

<i>Ann.</i>	Tacitus, <i>Annales</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
Ant.	Josephus, <i>Antiquitates Judaicae (Jewish Antiquities)</i>
<i>BJ</i>	Josephus, <i>Bellum Judaicum (Jewish War)</i>
BT	Babylonian Talmud
CD	Cassius Dio, <i>Roman History</i>
<i>CPJ</i>	<i>Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum</i> , I–III (edd. V. Tchirikover, A. Fuks and M. Stern; 1957–1964)
Feldman	<i>Josephus</i> , IX (Loeb Classical Library; ed. and trans. L. H. Feldman, 1965)
Gabba	E. Gabba, <i>Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della Bibbia</i> (1958)
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte
<i>GLA</i>	M. Stern, <i>Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism</i> , I–III (1974–1984)
Haenchen	E. Haenchen, <i>The Acts of the Apostles</i> (1971)
<i>Hist.</i>	Tacitus, <i>Historiae</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>INJ</i>	<i>Israel Numismatic Journal</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>Leg.</i>	Philo, <i>Legatio ad Gaium</i>
LSJ	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> (edd. H.G. Liddell, R. Scott and H. St. Jones; 1940 ⁹)
m.	Mishnah
<i>MGWJ</i>	<i>Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>OGIS</i>	<i>Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae</i> , I–II (ed. W. Dittenberger, 1903–1905)

PT	Palestinian Talmud
PWRE	<i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> (edd. G. Wissowa et al.; 1893–)
Smallwood, <i>Jews</i>	E. M. Smallwood, <i>The Jews Under Roman Rule, From Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations</i> (corrected ed., 1981)
Smallwood, <i>Leg.</i>	E. M. Smallwood, <i>Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium</i> (1970 ²)
<i>Studies</i>	D. R. Schwartz, <i>Studies on the Jewish Background of Christianity</i> (forthcoming)
SVM	E. Schürer, <i>The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, I–III</i> (edd. G. Vermes, F. Millar et al.; 1973–1987)
Tos.	Tosephta

Chapter I

Josephus on Agrippa

Introduction

Many sources are available for the reconstruction of Agrippa's life and career. Apart from the basic account in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* (*Ant.*) there are also important shorter accounts in the same historian's *Jewish War* (*BJ*), in Philo's *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Gaium* (*Leg.*), and in the Acts of the Apostles. Important too, although brief and scattered, are the references to Agrippa in the pages of some Roman historians (especially Cassius Dio), in rabbinic literature, and in one of the papyrus "Acts of the Pagan Martyrs" of Alexandria. There are also various inscriptions and coins, as well as other archaeological finds. To all of which we must add, of course, the manifold remains and evidence of the early Principate in general and Roman Judaea in particular, which help to illuminate the king's life and times even when they do not mention him specifically.

But despite this abundance of sources, the fact remains that only one gives a more or less continuous narrative. In comparison with Josephus' long account in *Ant.* (18.126–309 and all of Book 19), everything else consists of crumbs, if frequently important crumbs which may be used to supplement or correct it. It is necessary, therefore, to subject this narrative to special scrutiny before proceeding to the historical reconstruction of Agrippa's life. As explained in the Foreword, only such analysis of this narrative will allow us to evaluate the foundations upon which any study such as this must build.

Ant.'s narrative about Agrippa divides naturally, and chronologically, into four chapters:

1. *Ant.* 18.126–255: Birth until acquisition of Herod Antipas' territories (11/10 B.C.E. – 39 C.E.).
2. *Ant.* 18.256–309: Gaius Caligula's attempt to erect his statue in the Temple of Jerusalem (39–41 C.E.).
3. *Ant.* 19.1–291: Assassination of Caligula, accession of Claudius, and enthronement of Agrippa as king of Judaea (41 C.E.).

4. *Ant.* 19.292–366 (end of Book 19): Agrippa, King of Judaea, until his death (43/44 C.E.).¹

Of these four chapters, the first and the last are the most important for us, for they cover all of Agrippa's life apart from two – very fateful – years. Fortunately, they are also the easiest to analyze, due to the almost total lack of parallel or competing accounts, apart from Josephus' own narrative in *BJ*. Analysis of the second chapter is complicated by Philo's detailed report of the same episode, and the third chapter, which for the most part focuses on non-Jewish affairs in Rome, has its own problems. We shall therefore begin with the first and last chapters, and only thereafter, and with the aid of the conclusions of that analysis, will we tackle the two middle chapters.

Before beginning our analysis, however, we should say something about what we wish to know. Basically, we want to know what Josephus had on his table when he composed his narrative. In our work on Josephus, we have become increasingly convinced that he composed his narrative, in the latter half of *Ant.*, by juxtaposing extracts from his different sources in an attempt to intermesh them in what he took to be their proper chronological order. That is, Josephus frequently had more than one source regarding a given period or episode, illuminating it from different points of view, and his method of choice for dealing with this embarrassment of riches was to intermesh segments from each, rather than to compose his own new narrative on the basis of them all.² A modern historian may, therefore, hope that proper methods will allow him to dissect the narrative, recreate Josephus' tabletop, and then ignore Josephus and do the job of historical reconstruction himself.

This is, of course, an extreme formulation. Only rarely can one really ignore what Josephus did with his sources. Nevertheless, this basic approach, popular in the heyday of *Quellenkritik*, has yielded reasonable results with regard to other parts of *Ant.*, and I believe that it is worthwhile to apply it to the narrative on Agrippa I as well. The criteria we will use for distinguishing sources are the usual ones: contradictions (with regard to facts or attitudes); evidence of editorial "splicing;" doublets; existence of parallel versions; differential vocabulary; etc.

I. The First Chapter: *Ant.* 18.126–255

This chapter divides into two unbalanced sections: from Agrippa's birth until his acquisition of Philip's territories in 37 C.E. (§§ 126–237), and from then until 39 C.E., when Herod Antipas' tetrarchy too was annexed to

¹ On the date of Agrippa's death, see Chapter V, Section I.

² On this theme, see the Foreword.

Agrippa's kingdom (§§ 238–255). The account in *BJ* 2, although miniscule by comparison, is similarly split: §§ 178–181a comprise the first section, §§ 181b–183 comprise the second. It is therefore likely that comparison of Josephus' two narratives will be a fruitful place to begin our inquiry into his sources and procedures.

In the first section, up to 37 C.E., both versions agree on a number of important points. Namely, both report that Agrippa came to Rome while Tiberius was still alive and became close to Gaius; that he once expressed the hope that Gaius would soon replace Tiberius, and was imprisoned when one of his own servants informed on him; and that Gaius, who became emperor upon Tiberius' death six months Agrippa was imprisoned, released his friend and made him king of Philip's former territories.

Alongside this general agreement between the *BJ* and *Ant.* narratives, however, there are also serious differences. Of course, *Ant.* includes numerous episodes from the early part of Agrippa's life, before these events late in Tiberius' realm, and it also includes many more details about this affair as well. But this need not be significant from the point of view of sources, for Josephus' account in *BJ* is simply very short, as befits the introduction of a book about a war which began decades after Agrippa died. However, it may nevertheless be significant, for Josephus does go on at great length in some parts of *BJ*'s historical introduction, such as with regard to Herod, in sections where it is clear that his source for *BJ* (Nicolaus of Damascus) was the same one used in *Ant.*³ Perhaps, in other words, *BJ*'s “minuses,” in comparison with *Ant.*, point to the use of different sources.

Much more probative, however, are four real contradictions between the two accounts:

1. According to *BJ* (§ 178), Agrippa came to Rome in order to accuse Herod Antipas. *Ant.* (§ 155), in contrast, says Agrippa came to Rome (where he had rich friends) because he lacked the means to support himself elsewhere.

2. According to *BJ* (§ 179), the fateful conversation with Gaius took place while Agrippa and Gaius were dining. *Ant.* (§ 168) places it while they were riding together.

3. According to *BJ* (§ 179), what Agrippa said was that he hoped that Tiberius would soon die, so that Gaius could rule in his stead. *Ant.* (§ 168) has Agrippa hoping only that Tiberius would soon transfer rule to Gaius.

4. According to *BJ* (§ 180), the terms of Agrippa's imprisonment were especially severe. *Ant.* (§§ 203–204) says they were especially lenient, due to the efforts of Antonia Minor, Gaius' grandmother (daughter of Marcus Anto-

³ For some detailed comparison of the two, see S.J.D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian* (1979), pp. 52–58.

nus). This woman, indeed, is frequently mentioned in *Ant.* in connection with Agrippa (18.143, 156, 164–167, 179–186, 202, 236), but is not mentioned at all in *BJ*.

These four contradictions, within the space of *BJ*'s brief narrative, imply that Josephus had two sources regarding this period. For the meantime, we will call the one used in *BJ* "B" and the one used in *Ant.* "A." And, for the meantime, we will note only that the first and third contradictions hint that A was friendlier to Agrippa than B was, and it may be that the fourth one does too: it points out Agrippa's prominent connections. Let us now turn to the second section of this chapter, on the years 37–39, and see if the same contrast between Josephus' two accounts persists.

The answer is an unqualified negation. Both of Josephus' narratives (*BJ* 2.181b–183//*Ant.* 18.238–255) plainly depend upon the same source. Both agree that Agrippa's arrival in Palestine and reception as a king aroused his sister Herodias' jealousy, due to the fact that her husband, Herod Antipas, a generation older than Agrippa, was only a tetrarch; she therefore coaxed Antipas to go to Rome and request a crown for himself as well; he at first resisted but at last capitulated and off they went; but Agrippa managed to discredit his uncle, with the result that the latter was exiled and his territories added to Agrippa's kingdom. Both narratives even agree that Herodias *chose* to accompany her husband into exile, and that Antipas' fall was not a political event alone, but also a punishment for the moral sin of envy.

Alongside of this detailed agreement, there are hardly any contradictions worth mentioning. The only two which require discussion are easily explained without recourse to the notion of separate sources:

1. According to *BJ* (§ 183), Agrippa "followed Antipas (to Rome) as an accuser," but *Ant.* (§ 247) says Agrippa sent his accusations in letters, via his freedman Fortunatus. This is not an impressive contradiction, however, for *BJ* does not explicitly say that Agrippa went to Rome himself, and *Ant.*, for its part, apparently goes on to say, at the end of § 247, that Agrippa intended himself to voice his accusations before Gaius as soon as possible (§ 247).⁴ The

⁴ The sense of this passage is admittedly unclear. Does it mean, as Chamonard, Feldman and Schalit translate, that Agrippa not only sent written accusations but also wanted Fortunatus to present them orally when possible? Or does it rather mean, as Clementz seems to have assumed, that Agrippa not only sent written accusations but also intended to voice them himself when possible? The latter interpretation seems more probable, for three reasons: a) the *καὶ αὐτὸς* earlier in this sentence, which undoubtedly refers to Agrippa, is parallel to our ambiguous *καὶ αὐτὸν* at its conclusion; b) it does not appear that much could have been added by a freedman's oral repetition of Agrippa's charges, while Agrippa in person is obviously preferable to Agrippa in writing; and c) according to *Ant.* 18.238, which we will later attribute to the same source as 18.247, Agrippa had indeed promised Gaius that he would return to Rome after organizing his kingdom. In any case, the matter is not crucial.

BJ account may therefore be only a summarized version, as is natural, of the story reproduced more fully in *Ant.*

2. *BJ* (§183) says Antipas was exiled to Spain, while *Ant.* (§252) gives “Lugdunum, a city in Gaul,” i. e., Lyons. This discrepancy too may easily be explained, without recourse to the assumption of separate sources, in either of two alternate fashions: either a) his single source mentioned “Lugdunum,” and Josephus first (*BJ*) thought the reference was to Lugdunum Convenarum on the Spanish border but later (*Ant.*) learned that the Lyons of Gaul was meant; or b) the source explicitly referred to Lugdunum Convenarum, and Josephus, who first thought that the border city was in Spain, later decided to ascribe it to Gaul.⁵

Thus, it seems that Josephus followed the same source in *BJ* and *Ant.* for this second section of the first chapter. Was that source B or A, or was it a new one? As a working hypothesis, we shall proceed on the assumption that it was B, for two reasons. First, methodologically, we should not multiply putative sources more than necessary, and it is especially unreasonable to suppose that Josephus used many sources to produce his short *BJ* narrative here. The second reason is the fact that the interest in Herod Antipas, who is mentioned at the outset of our first extract from B (*BJ* 2.178), of course governs this second section of the first chapter as well. In order to give this hypothesis a broader basis, we should now look elsewhere in this chapter of *Ant.*, beyond the parts paralleled in *BJ*, for evidence of the use of B or A.

The account of Antipas’ fall obviously assumes there was hostility between Agrippa and the tetrarch. We may suppose, therefore, that the common source which lies behind this section of both books also explained the origin of that hostility. *Ant.* 18.147–150 offers such an explanation, reporting how Antipas supplied Agrippa with a livelihood but ungraciously exploited this in order to insult him. Significantly, precisely this story is recalled in 18.244, in the context of Antipas’ fall. Following the insult, Josephus reports (§§ 151–152), Agrippa left Antipas’ court and moved to that of Pomponius Flaccus, the Roman governor of Syria, but Agrippa’s brother Aristobulus, who was also there, managed to sour the relations between the two. How did that happen? Josephus ends § 152 with the introductory words “and these were the circumstances (αἰτίαι τῆς αὐτῆς) which he (Aristobulus) exploited for his hostility,” and then tells the detailed story (§§ 153–154).

The reader of §§ 151–154 might well wonder why Josephus first gave a summary of this affair and thereafter told its details. Why did he not simply

⁵ On this problem, see H. Crouzel, *Studia Patristica* 10 (1970), p. 275–280; H. W. Hohenher, *Herod Antipas* (1972), p. 262, n. 1; D. Braund, *Classical Quarterly* 33 (1983), pp. 241–242. None of these writers, however, addresses the source-critical implications of the question.

bring Agrippa to Flaccus' court in Antioch and tell what happened next? Of course, such a question might not require an answer. It is nevertheless interesting to note that precisely this structure (summary + introduction of the αἰτία + details) has been shown, elsewhere in *Ant.*, to be a typical Josephan way of inserting an excerpt from an auxiliary source into a narrative built upon something else.⁶

In our case, this would mean that §§ 147–150, which tell of Agrippa and Antipas, stem from a source (B?) different from that which told of Agrippa's difficulties with Aristobulus and Flaccus, in the wake of which he returned to Rome.

How did these sources continue? The answer will become clear, it seems, upon analysis of the next segment of the story, which deals with Agrippa's finances. According to §§ 155–158, Agrippa borrowed 20,000 drachmas from freedmen, for his travel expenses, but was arrested at Anthedon (near Gaza) by the imperial procurator, Herennius Capito, due to a debt of 300,000 drachmas to the imperial treasury. Agrippa managed to escape to Alexandria, and there he borrowed 200,000 drachmas (30,000 cash⁷ and the rest in a note redeemable in Dicaearcheia) from Alexander the Alabarch (§§ 159–160), allowing him to continue on to Italy. Just after he arrived at Tiberius's court in Capri, however, a letter also arrived – from Capito, reporting the affair of the 300,000 drachma debt, whereupon Tiberius refused to see Agrippa until the matter was resolved (§§ 161–164a). Therefore – and here is the main point for us – Agrippa was again bailed out by Antonia Minor, who lent him 300,000 drachmas, which allowed him to patch up his relations with the emperor (§§ 164b–165).

Now, if Agrippa had already arranged for 200,000 drachmas in Alexandria, most of which payable in Italy, why did he now need 300,000? Of course, many explanations suggest themselves. Our point is that Josephus doesn't offer any, nor does he comment upon the problem in any way. Which leads us to suspect that Josephus' account here is based upon two distinct sources, each of which had another version as to Agrippa's backer. And this suspicion

⁶ See, especially, H. G. M. Williamson, *JTS* 28 (1977), pp. 50–55. While Williamson concentrates upon the first, biblical, half of *Ant.*, many cases of such Josephan procedure may also be noted in the second half of the work as well. For a case with well-known rabbinic parallels for the inserted excerpt, see *Ant.* 17.165–167. Other cases include *Ant.* 18.91–95 (see my “Pontius’ Pilate Suspension from Office . . .,” *Tarbiz* 51 [1981/82], pp. 383–398 [in Hebrew; English in *Studies*]), and *Ant.* 14.268–270, 18.39–54, 20.141–144, which I have discussed in *JQR* 72 (1981/82), pp. 241–268.

⁷ Josephus speaks of five talents; it is usually assumed that each was worth six thousand drachmas. See Feldman, p. 105, n. b, also M. Broshi, *JJS* 38 (1987), p. 36, n. 21. Others, as Broshi notes, lean toward the assumption that Josephus calculated 10,000 drachmas to the talent. This doubt does not affect our argument here. Cf. below, Chapter V, n. 22.

becomes a nigh-certainty, in our mind, when we notice that § 160 uses the Greek name *Dicaearcheia*, while § 161, without any note or explanation, uses the Latin name *Puteoli* for the very same city.⁸ Lest there remain room for the suspicion that our text nevertheless refers to two different loans, we will note already here the historical point that Alexander was the steward of Antonia's property (*Ant.* 19.276), so it is easy to understand how it happened that two observers (or "tradents") could characterize this loan in two different ways: Alexander lent Agrippa Antonia's money.⁹

Since §§ 155–158 follow immediately upon §§ 151–154 and constitute their natural continuation (Agrippa returned to Italy after losing his last refuge in Judaea and Syria), there is no reason to doubt that they stem from the same source. But if §§ 159–160 are, as we have seen, based upon another source, then we may ask whether the latter is not identical with that which supplied the material prior to § 151, viz., the source which told of the Antipas-Agrippa clash (B?). An answer in the affirmative results not only from our usual methodological guideline limiting the number of sources we must assume Josephus had on his desk, but also from the fact that § 160, as § 148 (the opening of the Antipas-Agrippa story), praises the virtues of Agrippa's wife, Cypros. This woman plays no role in any other part of Josephus' narrative (he mentions her elsewhere only in genealogical lists), and, indeed, she seems to be mentioned only once more in all of ancient literature.¹⁰ This would thus seem a good indication that the Alexandrian loan story came from the same source as that which supplied the account of the clash between Antipas and Agrippa.

Our previous ascription of the first section of Josephus' first chapter in *Ant.* (18.126–237) to A must now be qualified, for it now appears that he used at least two sources in this section. One supplied the stories of the clash between Agrippa and Antipas and of the Alexandrian loan (§§ 147–150, 159–160), while the other supplied the Flaccus story and ascribed the same

⁸ As is natural for an oriental writing in Greek, Josephus uses "Dicaearcheia" frequently: *BJ2*.104; *Ant.* 17.328; 18.248–249; 19.5; *Vita* 16. "Puteoli" appears only once elsewhere in his writings, in *Vita* 16, along with the explicit note that it was the Italian name for Dicaearcheia. But there is no such explanation at *Ant.* 18.161. O. Henning noticed this switch of toponyms, but claimed that no particular significance should be attached to it, for both names remained in use in the Roman period (*Römische Stücke aus Josephus* [Diss. Tübingen, 1922], p. 32, n. 1); Henning relied upon H. Nissen, *Italienische Landeskunde* II/2 (1902), p. 737. But Nissen shows only that the Greek name was used by both Greek and Latin writers; he gives not a single parallel to the use of "Puteoli" by a Greek writer, or of a sudden passage from one toponym to the other, as in *Ant.* here.

⁹ Cf. Chapter II, n. 49.

¹⁰ See *BJ2*.220 and *Ant.* 18.131–132 (genealogical lists), also Philip of Thessalonica in the *Greek Anthology* 9.778. On the latter corrupt passage, which seems to refer to Cypros, see *GLA* I, pp. 375–376; C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (1922), pp. 351–355. On rabbinic literature, see Chapter VI, n. 84.

loan to Antonia (§§ 151–158, 161 ff.). The former source is interested in Antipas and his wife (as well as in Cypros), just as they are the central figures of the second section of the first chapter (*BJ* 2.181b–183; *Ant.* 18.238–255), which describes the fall of Antipas and which we have ascribed to B. Therefore, it is likely that B supplied *Ant.* 18.147–150, 159–160 too. This conclusion, which will be further supported in Appendix I on the basis of differential vocabulary, is also supported by our conclusion elsewhere, that a source which was interested in Herod Antipas and his wives supplied much of what immediately precedes the Agrippa material in *Ant.* 18 (§§ 96–126).¹¹ Josephus must still have had it on his desk. At this point, therefore, we will replace the siglum B with something more meaningful: *Antip* (source focusing on Antipas). This siglum, of course, does not say anything about the source's point of view. As we shall see, it is usually hostile toward its "hero."

And what of A? Our discussion has not yet dealt with §§ 143–146, which open the Agrippa story after Josephus' general comments and genealogical details of §§ 126–142, but we have seen that §§ 151–158 and 161 ff. are not based upon *Antip*. But neither is there any reason to associate §§ 143–146 with *Antip*; it has nothing to do with Antipas or his wives. On the other hand, §§ 143–146 focus upon Agrippa and the friendship between Agrippa's mother (Berenice) and Antonia, a theme mentioned in §§ 156 and 165 as well. We shall assume, therefore, that a single source supplied all three of these passages, and, with another promise of further support in Appendix I, we shall redub A "VAg" (*Vita* of Agrippa).

At this point, we have divided *Ant.* 18.143–161 ff. between VAg and *Antip*. In attempting to delimit the third segment based upon VAg, § 161 ff., we must now do something which will contribute little new information, but which should, we believe, buttress confidence in the legitimacy of dissecting Josephus the way we have on the assumption that he is usually juxtaposing extracts, not rewriting. I refer to the statement at the outset of § 166, according to which Tiberius ordered Agrippa to cultivate Tiberius Gemellus: it appears that this statement was added by Josephus into the text of a segment otherwise based upon VAg. Two stylistic points show that this is so: a) Tiberius is termed here "Tiberius Caesar," as if he were a new character in this context – but he appeared under that full name immediately before, at the end of § 165. Why did Josephus not use "Tiberius" or "Caesar" or even simply "he" in § 166a? b) § 166b begins with Ἀγρίππας δὲ, "as for Agrippa," which seems to reflect Josephus' returning his attention to VAg, just as he used the same phrase to turn from *Antip* to VAg in § 161. Moreover, the phraseology of this sentence does not reflect its *contrast* to the preceding narrative. Namely, § 166a reports that Tiberius ordered Agrippa to cultivate Tiberius Gemellus,

¹¹ See pp. 389–390 of my first essay mentioned above, n. 6.

and § 166b says that Agrippa stuck to Gaius, due to his friendship with Antonia. I believe that anyone writing both sentences together would have written “but” instead of “and” and perhaps inserted something else as well, such as “nonetheless,” to express the contrast between the emperor’s wishes and Agrippa’s practice. So although it is clear that Josephus means to point out this contrast, the fact that his style does not reflect it leads to the conclusion that one writer did not *compose* all of the text here. Rather, as we have suggested, Josephus has inserted § 166a into the midst of his *VAgr* narrative, and then resumed his use of *VAgr* with “as for Agrippa,” in § 166b.

It is not difficult to discover where Josephus gained the information he inserted in § 166a. He found it later in *VAgr*, in the report (§ 188) of Tiberius’ hearing of Agrippa which ended with the latter’s imprisonment. Here, indeed, the two sides of the matter are clearly contrasted: Tiberius was angry at Agrippa “who, though ordered to pay court to Tiberius . . . had disrespectfully ignored his orders and had given all his attention to Gaius instead” (trans. Feldman). What happened here, it seems, is that when Josephus found this retrospective detail later in *VAgr*, he undertook to insert it into its proper place. Here, then, we see both sides of Josephus: he attempts to bring chronological order into his narrative, but frequently, in this post-biblical half of *Ant.*, he does not attempt to rework his materials. In the main, he only juxtaposes them. Thus, while the conclusion that Josephus wrote § 166a on the basis of a later section of *VAgr* and stuck it in here does not add any information, the way in which these lines stick out as a sore thumb bolsters our confidence in the assumption that Josephus’ sources, and his seams and occasional insertions, may indeed be uncovered.

Let us continue pursuing Josephus’ sources. It is clear that §§ 166b–167 return us to *VAgr*, as is shown, as we have seen, by the opening “as for Agrippa” (Ἀγρίππας δὲ) and the reference to Antonia, a *VAgr* favorite. Moreover, it is interesting that § 167 shows an interest in a rich freedman, just as do other sections we have already attributed to *VAgr* (§§ 145, 156–157). In sections we’ve attributed to *Antip* there are no such allusions. In fact, *Antip* reports only one freedman altogether (*Ant.* 18.247),¹² while freedmen, even those who are not rich, play an important role in *VAgr*, as we shall see in the next paragraph.

¹² Fortunatus. As we noted above (at n. 4), the reference to this freedman engendered a minor difficulty for our assumption that *BJ* and *Ant.* followed a common source for Antipas’ fall. We overcame that difficulty easily. Now, however, that we have noticed *VAgr*’s great interest in freedmen, as opposed to *Antip* which never mentions them apart from here, we might consider the possibility that Josephus has inserted into *Antip* a detail he found in *VAgr*. Below, in our analysis of Josephus’ second and third chapters on Agrippa, we shall frequently note such procedure.

We have now arrived at § 168, which begins the story of Agrippa's faux pas which led to his imprisonment. It will be recalled that it was this story, as compared with the version in *BJ*, which first led us to surmise the existence of A. On the basis of what we have since learned about this source, which we have renamed *VAgr*, two further observations may lend support to that surmise. First, we note that freedmen play an important role in the story: the informer was a freedman (and not just a "servant," as in *BJ*); Josephus knows that the freedman had been accused of theft, and was indeed guilty (§ 169); and other freedmen of Agrippa, mentioned by name, are said to have visited him in prison (§§ 204, 228). Indeed, of one such freedman, Thaumastus, we read not only of his service at the time Agrippa was tried (§§ 192–193), but also of the reward he received upon Agrippa's release, and of his subsequent career, years later, as well (§ 194;¹³ cf. § 181). As we have noted, such interest in freedmen is characteristic of other sections we have attributed to *VAgr* (§§ 145, 156–157, 167). Second, in this section of *Ant.*, as in other passages we have attributed to *VAgr* (*Ant.* 18.143, 156, 164–167), Antonia is attributed a crucial role: Agrippa begged her to influence Tiberius upon his behalf, she did so (§§ 179–186), and when Agrippa was imprisoned she also did her best to improve his conditions (§§ 202–203). Moreover, in this same context we also read of her role in uncovering Sejanus' plot against Tiberius (§§ 181–182). Finally, at the end of the story it is she who advised Gaius Caligula, her newly-enthroned grandson, how to deal with Agrippa and to time properly his release from prison and coronation (§ 236). Thus, §§ 168–237, all the rest of this first section of *Ant.*'s first chapter on Agrippa, is based upon *VAgr*. Appendix I supplies further arguments from vocabulary supporting this conclusion.

Summary of our discussion of this first chapter (Ant. 18.126–255): Josephus' account of Agrippa until his first appointment to monarchy is based upon two sources. The first, which focuses upon Antipas and which we have termed *Antip*, lies behind all of this chapter in *BJ* (2.178–183) and

¹³ This notice, that Thaumastus continued to serve Agrippa's family as his children's *epitropos*, together with *VAgr*'s great interest in freedmen, might lend support for the theory that Thaumastus was Josephus' source for much of his material about Tiberius and Agrippa. See, for example, H. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus* (1879), p. 152; L. Feldman, *Latomus* 21 (1962), p. 333. However, we might just as reasonably nominate Protos, who formerly belonged to Berenice (Agrippa's mother) and later served Antonia (*Ant.* 18.156). Or perhaps we should think of Agrippa II, who seems to have supplied Josephus with information for *BJ* (see *Vita* 364–366); see Bloch (*ibid.*), pp. 153–154; Feldman (*loc. cit.*), p. 132; J. Nicols, *Historia* 24 (1975), pp. 53–55. However, it seems that one cannot do more than admit that any of these suggestions is a possibility, as are others, and the truth is that giving a name to the author of *VAgr* wouldn't add much. I would note only that the material assembled in the final section of this chapter points to the likelihood that the author was Jewish, perhaps from Rome.

Indices

I Names, Subjects and Ancient Sources

- Abbaye 159
Abila 60, 112
Acco
→ Ptolemais
Actian games 110–111
Acts of the Apostles
– ch. 12 96, 113–114, 119–124, 144–149, 153–156, 208–217
– general and other 1, 68, 71–73, 94–96, 117–118, 120–122, 124, 148, 154–156, 189, 208–216
“Acts of the Pagan Martyrs” 1, 41, 75, 96–99, 102, 105
agoranomos 48
Agrippa I and II *passim*
Agrippa, Marcus Vipsanius 39, 40, 42
Alexander (Herod’s son) 39, 43
Alexander Jannaeus 68, 132, 159, 170
Alexander Severus 42
Alexander the Alabarch 6, 7, 29, 50, 56, 75, 93, 134
Alexandria, Jews of xii, 13, 13, 30, 55, 60, 74–77, 80, 83–84, 86, 97–106, 134, 172, 196–198
Alexas 113
Ambivulus, M. 63
Ananus 69–71
Ananus son of Ananus 72–73
angels 120, 145, 148, 212
Anthedon 6, 49, 50
Antigonos
→ Mattathias Antigonos
Antioch 6, 49, 51, 82, 93, 107
Antiochus IV Epiphanes 148
Antiochus IV of Commagene 29, 168, 134, 137–138, 152
Antip 2–11, 38, 46, 50–51, 56, 58, 177–178
Antipater (Herod’s father) 40, 219
Antipater (Herod’s son) 41
Antonia Minor 3, 6–10, 32, 40, 41, 50, 51, 54, 93, 138
Apion 80
Apollonius Rhodius 147
apologetics
– Christian 95, 122–123, 156, 216
– Jewish 15–16, 75, 80–81, 104–105, 129–130, 171, 201
Apostolic Council 208–209, 212, 214–216
Appian 132
Aquila (of Acts 18) 94
Aquila the Proselyte 168
Aramaic 44, 160
Archelaus (son of Herod) 62, 111–113, 172
Aristeas, Letter of 176, 181
Aristobulus (Agrippa I’s father) 39, 40, 66, 150, 219
Aristobulus (Agrippa I’s brother) 5, 6, 19, 39, 43, 49, 138
Aristotle 157
army 11, 13, 14, 63, 64, 113–115, 168
Arruntius, L. 183
Artabanus 58–59, 138
Ashdod 111
Ashi, R. 165
Athens 132
Augustus 40–41, 52, 66, 80, 104, 109–111, 149, 152, 202, 206
Auranitis 56, 60, 114, 201
Azizus of Emesa 134
Baalbek
→ Heliopolis
Babylonians 70, 114
Baiae, Gulf of 199

- Banias 201
 → also Caesarea Philippi
 banqueting 35, 45, 133, 157
 Batanaea 52, 60, 70, 114, 201
 Beelzebub 12
 Beirut
 → Berytus
 Berenice (Agrippa I's daughter) 51, 56, 76,
 132, 134, 138, 170, 175
 Berenice (Agrippa I's mother) 10, 39–43,
 45, 219
 Berytus 107, 132, 133, 144, 173, 175
 Bezetha 140–141, 143
 birthday 34, 133
 Blastus 113
 Boethus 70, 116, 185–189
boule 131
 Britain 151, 203–204

 Caesarea Maritima 16, 82, 109–111, 115,
 124–125, 130–131, 145, 155–156,
 181–182, 204–207, 213
 Caesarea Philippi 60, 73, 111
 “Caesar's friend” 60, 135
 Caesonia 74
 Caiaphas, Joseph 69, 116, 189–195
 Caligula
 → Chapter III and *passim*
 Campania 84, 86, 88, 198
 Cantheras (Simon and Eliehoeinai) 12, 14,
 68, 70–71, 73, 115–116, 130, 185–195
 capital jurisdiction 72, 118, 133
 Capito, Herennius 6, 49, 63, 80–81, 83, 88
 Capri 51
 Cassius Dio 1, 45, 54, 58, 60, 68, 91–92,
 94–95, 111, 138, 147, 152, 198–199, 203
 census 167–168
 Cestius Gallus 167
Chaer 23–30, 38
 Chaerea, Cassius 24–27, 30, 32
 Chrestus 94, 96, 153
 Christians, Christianity xii, 71–73, 94–96,
 117–124, 146–147, 153–156, 173–174,
 208–216
 chronology
 – Agrippa's death 107–111, 203–207
 – Agrippa's life 39, 46–47, 51, 55, 67–68,
 76, 93, 96–97, 163
 – Christian 72–73, 210–211, 214–216
 – Claudius' letter to Alexandria 102
 – rabbinic 118, 161, 169
 – regnal years 57–58, 108–111
 – Temple-statue and legation to Gaius
 78–80, 83–86, 196–199
 – other 62, 149, 187
 circumcision 127, 134, 168
 Cithae(r)us 188; see also Cantheras
Claud 23–30, 38, 141
 Claudius
 → Chapter IV and *passim*
 Clement of Rome 122
 coins 57, 67, 73, 92, 108, 111, 120, 131,
 135–136, 142, 150, 203–204
 Cornelius (of Acts 10) 155–156
 Costobar 39, 125, 219
 Cotys (of Armenia Minor) 137–138
 Crinagoras 42
 Crispus 114
 cubicularius 113
 Cumanus, Ventidius 97
 Cypros (II, Agrippa I's wife) xv, 7, 46–48,
 50–52, 56, 170, 219
 Cypros I (Herod's mother) 219, 221

 Damascus 49
 Davidic descent 162, 219
 descent (pedigree) 124–129, 159, 162,
 219–222
 Diaspora xii, 13, 31, 35, 77, 82, 84, 88,
 93–106, 172, 179, 213
Diasporanovellen 35, 87
 Dicaearcheia xv, 6, 7, 50, 178
 Diodorus Siculus 113, 176
 Domitian 169
 Dora 14, 16, 22, 31, 93, 107, 135, 140, 181
 Drusilla (Agrippa I's daughter) 134, 138
 Drusilla (Gaius' sister) 196
 Drusus (Agrippa I's son) 51
 Drusus the Younger 42, 45–47, 53, 134

 Eleazar (son of Ananus) 69
 Eleazar b. Zadok 118
 Eliehoeinai
 → Cantheras
 Eliezer b. Hyrcanus 168–169
eparchos 63, 113, 114
 Ephesus 210–211
 Epiphanes (son of Antiochus IV
 of Commagene) 134
epitropos 10, 168–169
 Esther 34–35, 87
 Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8) 213–214
 ethnarch 104

- Eusebius 20, 21, 145–149, 178, 181, 206–207, 210–211
 Eutyclus 44–45, 54
 Exodus (from Egypt) 120, 153–154
 Ezra 127
- Fadus, Cuspius 64, 149
 Felix 71, 72, 97, 134, 150
 Festus, Porcius 72
 finances 11, 45, 49–50, 52, 62, 63, 65, 68–70, 74, 99, 112–113, 132, 150–151
 first–fruits 163–164
 Flaccus, Aulus Avillius 76, 88, 103, 196–197
 Flaccus, L. Pomponius 5–7, 43, 47, 49, 50–51, 183–184
 flattery 147–148, 160–162, 171, 180, 220–221
 Fortunatus 4, 9, 44–45, 57, 59
 freedmen 4, 6, 9, 10, 17, 18, 44, 45, 49, 52, 54, 150
- Gabini the Herald 167
 Gadara 111
 Gaius (Caligula)
 → Chapters II–III and *passim*
 Galatians, Epistle to 72, 122, 208–211, 215
 Galilee 62, 112, 201
 Gallio 94
 Gamaliel, Rabban 169, 170
 games 109–111, 133, 134, 146
 Gaul 5
 Gaulanitis 52, 60
 Gaza 6, 49, 111
 Gentiles
 – Agrippa and 43–44, 124, 130–134
 – in Church 121–123, 154–155, 213–214
 George Hamartolus 210
 Germanicus 25, 74, 90
 Gratus, Valerius 69, 189
 “Great”, “the Great” 136
 Greek 44, 92
Greek Anthology 7, 42
- Hanina b. Gamaliel 161
 Hasmoneans 43, 82, 93, 130–131, 135, 159, 171–173, 221
 Hebrew 44, 159–160
 Helicon 198
 Heliopolis 60, 132, 144, 173
 Helkias 19, 113, 114
 Herod, King of Judaea *passim*
 “Herod” (as name for Agrippa) 40, 120, 215
 Herod II of Chalcis 13, 29, 44, 52, 60, 62, 65, 66, 69, 92, 100, 120, 134, 215, 216
 “Herodians” 120
 Herodias 4, 8, 11, 40, 46, 48, 56, 58, 60, 69, 120
 Herodium 172
 high priests, high priesthood 11, 12, 64–65, 68, 69–73, 115–118, 122, 130, 154, 165, 185–195, 209
 Hilkiah the Great
 → Helkias
hipparchos 63
 Hippios 111
 Hulatha 60, 201
 Idumaea, Idumaeans 43, 48, 125, 127, 159, 219, 221, 222
 inscriptions 42, 45, 56, 94, 103–104, 110–111, 113–114, 127–128, 132, 136, 203
 Irenaeus 210
 Isactium 110–111
 Isidorus 96, 101, 196–197
 “Israel”, “Israelite” 165, 222
 Ituraea, Ituraeans 70, 127, 151
 Jabneh 63, 80–84, 105, 111, 169
 James the Just 72, 118, 209
 James, son of Zebedee 119–123, 133, 208–212
 Jerome 192
 Jerusalem 11, 13, 40, 62, 77–89, 114, 123, 131, 136, 154–156, 160, 167, 179, 188, 205, 213, 216
 – walls of 15, 140–144, 151
 → also Temple of Jerusalem
 Jesus of Nazareth 72, 94, 117, 153, 161
 John Hyrcanus 159, 219
 John Mark 210
 John the Baptist 47
 John, Gospel of 96, 123, 189
 John, son of Zebedee 119–123, 133, 208–212
 Jonathan, son of Ananus 71, 115
 Joseph (biblical patriarch) 34–35, 49, 53–55, 77, 91
 Joseph, son of Tobiah 36
Josephus passim
 Jubilees, Book of 119, 127
 Judah the Galilean 215
 Judah the Prince 118
 Julia (Augustus’ widow) → Livia
 Julia (city) 60

- Julius Archelaus 113, 134
 Julius Caesar 40, 149

 Lamia, L. Aelius 183
 Lampon 96, 101, 196–197
 Latin 44, 92
 Livia 41, 111
 Lugdunum 5
 Luke, Gospel of 47, 60, 65, 72, 105, 123,
 167, 208, 211
 Lycia 151
 Lyons 5
 Lysanias 55, 59–60, 62–63, 67, 112, 201

 Maccabees, Books of 35, 48, 73, 148
 Macro, Q. Naevius Cordus Sutorius 55, 97
 “magnanimity” 157, 178
maiestas 54, 76
 Malalas, Johannes 93
 Malatha 46–48
 Marcellus 62–63, 72–73
 Marcus (son of Alexander the Alabarch)
 76, 134
 Marcus Antonius 3, 40, 132
 Mariamme (Agrippa I’ sister) 40
 Mariamme (Agrippa I’s daughter) 51, 113,
 134
 Mariamme (I, the Hasmonean) 39, 219
 Mariamme II (Herod’s wife) 185–186
 Mark, Gospel of 75, 123, 133, 148, 167,
 208, 210, 211
 Marsus, Vibius 14, 15, 17, 64, 137–144
 Marsyas 44, 49
 martyrs, martyrdom 81, 211
 Marullus 62–63
 matrilineality 221–222
 Mattathias Antigonus 131, 222
 Mattathias, son of Ananus 71, 115–116
 Mattathias, son of Theophilus 186–189
 Matthew, Gospel of 123, 208, 210, 211
 Mauretania 151
Megillat Ta’anit
 → rabbinic literature
minim 168
 Mishnah
 → rabbinic literature

 Nabateans 43, 206, 221
 Nathan, R. 160–161
 Nazirites 56, 68, 134, 170
 Nero 85, 96, 147, 167
 Nicolaus of Damascus 3, 113, 157, 204

 Olympiads 204–206
 Onias (III and IV) 162
 Origen 161
ornamenta 60, 92
 Orosius, P. 94–95, 153, 216
 owl 37, 145, 148–149
P. London 1912 100–106, 135
 Pallas 71, 150
 Papias 148, 210–211
 Parthia, Parthians 58, 59, 137–139, 151,
 170, 198
 Passover 119–121, 164
 patronage 131–133
 Paul 68, 71, 72, 94, 154–156, 210–211, 214
 Peraea 62, 112
 Peter 119–123, 130, 133, 147, 154,
 208–212, 216
Petr 14–20, 38, 180–182
 Petronius, P. 14, 16, 18–23, 31, 33, 64,
 77–89, 107, 135, 137, 140, 181, 202
 Pharisees 116–117, 126, 159, 170–171
 Phasaël (I and II) 219
 Phasaëlis 111
 Philip (Herod’s son) 2, 11, 12, 49, 52, 54,
 56, 59, 60, 62–63, 108, 112–113, 138,
 152, 201
 Philip of Thessalonica 7
 Philip Sidetes 210
 Philip the Deacon 214
 Philo xiv, 1, 12, 13, 18–23, 29, 31–33, 44,
 50, 55, 60, 63, 65, 67, 68, 74–89, 96, 99,
 104, 157, 158, 164, 178–182, 200–202
 Philostratus 147
philotimia 170
 Phoenicia 18, 78
 Pilate, Pontius xi, 62, 65, 72, 73, 86, 140,
 172, 201–202
 Piso, L. 183
 Piso, L. Calpurnius 36–37
 Plautius, Aulus 140
 Pliny the Elder 207
 Plutarch 42
 poisoning 149, 218
 Polemo 134, 137–138
 Pollio, Asinius 44
 Polycrates 211
praefectus urbi 36–37, 54
 priestly Judaism 118–130, 159–160, 220
 Priscilla 94
 proselytes, proselytism 126–129, 175,
 219–220
 Protos 10, 44–45, 49

- Providence (Divine) 11, 20, 33, 85
 Ptolemais 18, 22, 78, 84–85
 Puteoli xv, 7, 50, 83, 178
- Qumran 128, 160
 rabbinic literature
 – *Megillat Ta’anit* 12–13, 87, 140
 – Mishnah 68, 107, 114, 118–119, 121–122, 133, 159–164, 171, 189, 190–191, 221, 222
 – other and general 12, 35, 68, 113, 117–119, 127, 129, 133, 140, 148, 158–171, 191, 219–222
 relative deprivation 173
 religion and state xii, 81–82, 105–106, 123–124, 129–130, 174–175, 222
 Rhodes 151
 Rome, Jews of xii, 10, 37, 43, 47, 93–96, 123, 172
 Rufus, A. 63
 ruler cult 80, 133, 147–149, 200
- sabbatical year 107, 159–161
 Sabinus 26
 sacrifices 55, 56, 68, 117, 129, 133, 165–167, 170, 174, 200–201
 Sadducees 116–130, 132
 Salampsio 219
 Salome (Herod’s sister) 39, 41, 111, 113, 125, 219
 Samaria 62, 115
 Samaritans 213
 Sampsigeramus of Emesa 137–138
 Sanhedrin 71–72, 122, 209
 Sardinia 47
 sea travel 75, 85–86, 178, 182, 196
 Sebaste 114–115, 131–132
 Sejanus 10, 58
 Senate 23, 24, 26–30, 42, 68, 91–92, 135
 Seneca 54, 140, 157
 Sepphoris 169
 Septuagint 81
 Sidon 49, 144, 146–147
 Silas 13–15, 17, 70–71, 113, 114
 Simeon ben Gamaliel 170
 Simon (critic of Agrippa) 124–130, 157, 170
 Simon Cantheras
 → Cantheras
 Simon the Just 12, 68
soteria 110
 Spain 5, 183–184
Spitznamen 194–195
- Stephen 71–73, 117–119, 155, 214
 Strabo 41, 127
strategos 114, 124
 Strato’s Tower
 → Caesarea Maritima
 Suetonius 24, 44–46, 52, 90, 92, 94–96, 110, 134, 147, 199
sukkah
 → Tabernacles
syntrophos 42, 138
 Syria, governor and province 5, 13–15, 43, 52, 56, 59, 64, 65, 82, 103, 111, 137–144, 149, 151–153, 167, 183–184
- Tabernacles (festival) 107, 159, 169, 196
 Tacitus 12, 15, 36, 45, 46, 51, 54, 58, 81, 84, 87–88, 95, 96, 137, 140–141, 147, 150, 153, 183–184, 215–216
 talent 6, 112–113
 Tarphon, R. 161
 taxation
 → “finances” and “tribute”
 Temple of Jerusalem
 – Agrippa and 11–13, 33, 67–69, 124–130, 159–164, 167, 170
 – Christians and 117–118
 – Destruction of xii, 156, 160–161, 172, 174–175
 – entrance into 124–130
 – Temple-statue affair xii, 12, 16, 18–23, 77–89, 140, 172, 178–180, 200–202
 Ten Commandments 73, 131, 168
 Testament of Joseph 35
 Thaumastus 10, 44
 Theudas 215
 Theophilus, son of Ananus 69–70, 185
 Thrace 150–151
 Tiberias 15–16, 18, 21, 47, 48, 77–79, 85, 113, 136–140
 Tiberius
 → Chapter II and *passim*
 Tiberius Gemellus 8, 9, 52
 Tiberius Julius Alexander 93
 Timagenes 127
 Titus 134, 175
 Torah, septennial reading of 44, 159–163
 Trachonitis 60, 114, 201
 Trajan xii, 172, 174
 tribute 132, 201
 Tyche 207
 Tyre 144, 146–147

- VAgr* Chapter I *passim*, 45, 49–52, 54–55,
77–78, 91–92, 133, 135, 148, 157,
176–178
Vitellius, L. 56, 59, 62–65, 69, 71,
139–140, 184
weights 48, 57–58, 136, 188
widow's mite 167
worms 120, 146, 148, 216
Zadok, R. 118
zealots 123
Zebedee, sons of 119–123, 133, 208–212
Zionism 171
Zonaras 188

II Authors Cited

- Abel, F.-M. 172
Aberbach, M. 150, 218
Adler, S. xvi, 218
Africa, T. 148
Albeck, Ch. 119, 133, 161, 164
Alon, G. 97, 125–126, 139, 219, 222
Altschuler, M. 139, 171
Amir, Y. 87, 179, 181
Amusin, I.D. 135
Anderson, J.G.C. 138
Applebaum, S. 70
Aptowitz, V. 114, 161
Attridge, H.W. 33
Avi-Yonah, M. 136, 142
Avigad, N. 58, 188
- Baldus, H.R. 137
Balsdon, J.P.V.D. 26, 57, 77, 79, 86, 97, 151, 197–198
Bamberger, B.J. 220–221
Bar-Asher, M. 221
Barnes, T.D. 52, 205
Bauer, W. 123, 189
Baumgarten, A.I. 126
Baumgarten, J.M. 43, 125, 128, 159, 171, 220
Bell, H.I. 98, 100–102
Ben-Arieh, S. 142
Ben-Dov, M. 143
Benoit, P. 141–142
Berg, S.B. 35
Bergmann, W. 76
Bergsträsser, G. 193
Bernard, J.H. 210–211
Bernegger, P.M. 205
Betz, H.D. 217
Betz, O. 129
Beyer, H.W. 53
Bickerman, E. 173
Bietenhard, H. 112
- Bilde, P. xii, xiv, 77, 79, 81, 82, 84, 87, 177, 202
Blau, J. 193, 221
Blinzler, J. 118, 122, 133
Bloch, H. 10
Blosser, D. 107
Bokser, B.M. 222
Bonaria, M. 110
Bowersock, G. 183, 206
Box, H. 75
Brandon, S.G.F. 81, 123
Brann, M. 161, 163
Braude, W.G. 220–221
Braun, M. 35
Braund, D. 5, 41, 44, 59, 60, 132, 134, 144
Brawley, R.L. 117
Breuer, Y. 163–164
Brockelmann, C. 191, 193
Brody, R. xvi, 189, 190–195
Brooke, G.J. 128
Broshi, G. 141, 143
Brown, R.E. 210
Bruce, F.F. 124, 210
Bruggen, J. van 57, 58
Brüll, N. 121
Büchler, A. 68, 118, 119, 160, 161, 164
Burchard, C. 154
Bureth, P. 31
Burnett, A. 57, 73, 92, 131, 135, 204
Burr, V. 50, 93
- Cadbury, H.J. 94, 195, 217
Cadoux, T.J. 36
Carcopino, J. 110
Casson, L. 85
Cassuto, M.
Chamonard, J. 4
Charlesworth, M.P. xi, 58, 75, 80, 92, 133, 183–184
Chaumont, M.–L. 137–138
Ciaceri, E. xi, 41, 51, 66, 139, 150

- Cichorius, C. 7
 Clementz, H. 4
 Clermont-Ganneau, C. 128
 Cohen, G.M. 70
 Cohen, N. 166
 Cohen, S.J.D. 3, 113, 157, 175, 206, 222
 Colson, F.H. 181
 Corradi, G. 42
 Crouzel, H. 5
 Cullmann, O. 121–123, 211
 Cumont, F. 110
- Dalman, G.H. 192
 Damti (Ashbat), Y. 193
 Danby, H. 222
 Daube, D. 36, 164
 Dauvillier, J. 123
 Davies, P.S. 74
 Davies, W.D. 213
 De Marco, A.A. 212
 Debevoise, N.C. 137
 Delaunay, F. 201
 Delahaye, H. 162
 Delling, G. 80
 Derenbourg, J. 158, 163, 170, 171
 Dessau, H. 102, 109, 114, 131–132, 207
 Destinon, J. von 24–25, 176, 177
 Dibelius, M. 72, 146, 148
 Dinkler, E. 212
 Dockx, S. 72–73, 108, 207
 Dorey, T.A. 71, 140, 150, 151
 Downey, G. 93
 Downing, F.G. xiv
 Drower, E.S. 192
 Dubberstein, W.H. 111
 Dudley, D.R. 203
 Dupont, J. 120, 154, 213, 215
 Dussaud, R. 60
- Edels, S.E. (Maharsha) 171
 Edgar, C.C. 103
 Eisler, R. 209–211
 Engers, M. 100
 Ensslin, W. 139
 Epstein, J.N. 161
 Erhart, K.P. 42
- Feldman, L.H. *passim*
 Festinger, L. 175
 Filmer, W.E. 205
 Finegan, J. 208
 Fishwick, D. 151
- Fitzmyer, J.A. 47, 126, 167
 Flusser, D. 75
 Foster, S.S. 76
 Fraenkel, J. 166
 Frankel, Z. 118, 169
 Frere, S. 203
 Frey, J.—B. 45
 Fridrichsen, A. 122
 Friedländer, M. 171
 Fuchs, L. 90
 Fuks, A. 134
 Fuks, G. 74
- Gabba, E. 113, 132
 Gaechter, P. 73, 107
 Gafni, I. 81
 Gagé, J. 110–111
 Gager, J.G. 173
 Gahéis, A. 163
 Gan, M. 35
 Gapp, K.S. 215
 Garzetti, A. 59
 Gaston, L. 117
 Geagan, D.J. 132
 Geiger, A. 129
 George, A. 154–155
 Gera, D. 36
 Gerlach, H. 113, 120, 131, 145
 Gihon, M. 48
 Gilboa, A. 40
 Ginzberg, L. 168
 Gnilka, J. 155
 Goguel, M. 121, 123, 210
 Goldstein, J.A. 163
 González Echegaray, J. 114
 Goodblatt, D. xv, 13, 68, 116, 124, 126,
 158, 159, 161, 170
 Goodman, M. 174
 Graetz, H. 12, 90, 139, 160, 163, 164, 168,
 169, 171, 175
 Grintz, J.M. 160
 Groag, E. 36
 Grünewald, I. 209
 Gurr, T.R. 174
 Gutschmid, A. von 136, 206
 Guttman, M. 158
- Habas, E. 162
 Habicht, C. 80
 Haenchen, E. 72, 120–123, 156, 207, 211,
 214, 215, 217
 Hamrich, E.W. 141–142

- Haneman, G. 193
 Hanslik, R. 140
 Harmand, L. 132
 Harnack, A. [von] 217
 Heinemann, J. 166
 Henessy, J.B. 141–142
 Hengel, M. 72, 123, 124, 209
 Hennig, D. 32, 58
 Henning, O. 7, 24, 32
 Herr, M.D. 114, 168–169
 Heussi, K. 210
 Hobart, W.K. 217
 Hoehner, H.W. xiii, 5, 47, 57, 59, 62, 113, 211
 Hoenig, S. 161
 Hoffmann, C. 76
 Hoffmann, D. 159–160, 171
 Hornblower, J. xiv, 176
 Hug, A. 195
 Huidekoper, F. 12
 Hunt, A.S. 103
 Huzar, E.G. 40

 Ilan, T. 44, 126

 Jaccard, E. xi, 43, 117
 Jacobson, H. 36
 Jewett, R. 208, 211
 Jones, A.H.M. 49, 63, 76, 80, 117, 171
 Jones, H.S. 101
 Jordan, R. 134
 Jouguet, P. 102
 Jung, H. 24, 90

 Kaplan, J. 48
 Kasher, A. 48, 49, 64, 70, 75, 76, 82, 86, 97, 100–104, 107, 127, 135, 144, 171, 179, 183, 220, 222
 Kaufmann, Y. 127
 Kazimirski, A. 192
 Kellermann, U. 120
 Kellner, H. 184
 Kenyon, K.M. 141
 Kilpatrick, G.D. 72
 Kindler, A. 135, 150
 Klein, S. 114, 191
 Klimowsky, E.W. 136–137
 Klinzing, G. 129
 Knoche, U. 157
 Kochavi, M. 48
 Körtner, U.J. 211
 Koestermann, E. 36, 94, 140, 153

 Kohnke, F.W. 201
 Kraay, C.M. 135
 Krauss, S. 48, 169
 Krochmal, A. 118
 Krochmal, N. 116
 Kümmel, W.G. 217
 Kürzinger, J. 210
 Kuhn, K.G. 128
 Kutscher, Y. 191

 Labat, R. 217
 Lämmer, M. 109–110, 134, 157, 173, 175, 204–206
 Lagarde, P.A. de 192
 Lake, K. 94, 108, 110, 207, 208
 Laqueur, R. 100
 Lauffray, J. 132
 Lawrence, T.E. 48
 Le Moyne, J. 117, 119
 Lehmann, J. 160
 Lémonon, J.-P. xiii, 64, 65, 72, 113, 114, 200
 Leon, H.J. 43
 Levick, B. 42, 52, 54, 150
 Levine, L.I. (or: I.L.) 110, 126, 207
 Libowitz, N.S. 158, 168
 Lichtenstein, H. 140
 Lieberman, S. 118, 159, 161, 164
 Lifshitz, B. 45, 48, 135
 Lightfoot, J.B. 210
 Lightstone, J.N. 118
 Lösch, S. 145, 217
 Lohse, E. 131, 133
 Luedemann, G. 94, 208, 210, 211
 Lurie, B.Z. 132

 Macuch, R. 192
 Magie, D. 48, 59, 151–152
 Maharsha 171
 Malam, A. 43
 Mandel, P. 167
 Maoz, Z. 142–143
 Marsh, F.B. 36, 46, 58
 Martin, A. 136
 Mason, S. 119
 Mayer, L.A. 142
 Mayer, R. 218
 McNulty, I.B. 142
 Meinhold, A. 35
 Merrins, E.M. 217
 Merx, W.G. 217

- Meshorer, Y. 48–49, 57, 73–74, 120, 128, 131, 132, 135, 150, 203–204
 Meyer, E. 145–146, 209–210
 Meyer, R. 117
 Meyshan, J. 73–74, 137, 203, 218
 Miller, S.S. 114, 169
 Möller, C. 48
 Momigliano, A. xv, 26, 44, 92, 95, 101, 150, 152
 Mommsen, T. 54, 104, 115
 Morag, S. 191, 193
 Moreshet, M. 191
 Moretti, L. 110
 Morgenstern, J. 111
 Murmelstein, B. 36
 Musurillo, H.A. 42, 96–99, 101
- Naber, J.C. 41
 Nestle, E. 192
 Nestle, W. 148
 Netzer, E. 142, 172
 Neusner, J. 166, 221
 Nicols, J. 10, 32, 42
 Niermeyer, J. 195
 Niese, B. 13, 19, 124–125, 188
 Nissen, H. 7
- O'Collins, G.G. 155
 O'Connor, D.W.M. 212
 Olitzki, M. 160
 Oost, S.I. 71
 Opelt, I. 149
 Orth, W. 63, 183
 Ott, H. 160
 Otto, W. xiii, 39, 45, 102, 114, 136, 206, 219
- Pallis, A. 208–209
 Pape, W. 44
 Parker, E.R. 44
 Parker, R.A. 111
 Paton, L.B. 35
 Pease, A.S. 148
 Pelletier, A. 59, 60, 99, 176–177
 Perles, J. 194
 Pervo, R.I. 35
 Pixner, B. 141
 Polaček, A. 76
 Premerstein, A. von 97
 Priero, G. 145
 Prigent, P. 52
 Pucci, M. 75, 101
- Qedar, S. 48, 136
- Rabbinovicz, R. 164, 167
 Rabello, A.M. 128, 134
 Rabinovitz, N.D. 158, 160, 161, 163
 Radl, W. 120
 Rajak, T. 72, 87, 160
 Rappaport, S. 119
 Rappaport, U. xvi, 173, 174
 Raschke, M.G. 48
 Rashi 161, 168
 Reicke, B. 117, 213
 Reifenberg, A. 203–204
 Reinhold, M. 40
 Reisch, E. 110
 Rengstorf, K.H. 125, 209
 Rieks, R. 110–111
 Rigg, H.A. 52
 Rinaldi, P.G. 131
 Ringel, J. 110, 207
 Robinson, D.F. 212
 Rogers, R.S. 46
 Roos, A.G. 206
 Rosenfeld, B.-Z. 113
 Rosenzweig, A. 156
 Rostovtzeff, M. 50, 113
 Roth-Gerson, L. 93
 Ruggini, L.C. 76
- Safrai, S. 107, 160–161, 164, 168
 Sahlin, H. 208–209
 Samuel, A.E. 111
 Sanders, J.T. 117, 124
 Sands, P. 132
 Saulnier, C. 47
 Scaliger, J.J. 149
 Schäfer, P. 218
 Schalit, A. xiii, 4, 39, 40, 43, 77, 113–115, 132, 162, 171, 173, 175, 181, 206, 219
 Schaller, B. 179
 Schiffman, L.H. 221–222
 Schmitt, G. 48, 142
 Schmitt, H.H. 136
 Schottroff, W. 153
 Schreckenberger, H. 146
 Schubart, W. 100
 Schürer, E. (including *SVM*) *passim*
 Schulthess, F. 193
 Schwartz, D.R. *passim*
 Schwartz, E. 108–110, 206–207, 209–211
 Schwartz, J. 39, 50
 Schwartz, S. xiv, 136, 158, 162

- Schwarz, A. 140
 Schwarz, E. 119
 Scobie, C.H.H. 47
 Scramuzza, V.M. 24, 27, 28, 90, 101, 103,
 133, 151, 218
 Sevenster, J.N. 173
 Sherwin-White, A. 55, 104
 Shivtiel, Y. 193
 Shohat, Y. 54
 Sijpesteijn, P.J. 76, 196–198
 Smallwood, E.M. *passim*
 Smaltz, W.M. 212
 Smith, M. 116, 117
 Snyder, W.F. 111
 Spadafora, F. 156
 Sperber, D. 48, 131
 Spicq, C. 60, 110, 148, 217
 Spitta, F. 210
 Spranger, P.P. 136
 Stähelin, F. 90
 Stauffenberg, A. Schenk, Graf von 93
 Stauffer, E. 209
 Stegemann, H. 128, 166
 Stein, Alla 57, 73
 Stein, Arthur 42, 100
 Stein, M. 167
 Stern, M. *passim* (Genesis 15:5)
 Strobel, A. 120, 141
 Strom, M. 148
 Strugnell, J. 128
 Sukenik, E.L. 142, 203
 Sullivan, D.R. 138, 152
 Sussmann, Y. 167
 Swan, J.G. xi
 Syme, R. 183
- Tcherikover, V. A. 91, 97–105, 131, 173,
 195
- Testuz, M. 119
 Thackeray, H.St.J. 176
 Timpe, D. 24–25, 90
 Trocmé, E. 121, 147
 Tykocinski, J.M. 140
- Urbach, E.E. 133, 161
- Vermes, G. 128–129, 168
 Vitucci, G. 36, 54
- Waagenaar, S. 91
 Wacholder, B.Z. 107, 163
 Walaskay, P.W. 124
 Walbank, F.W. 42
 Weiser, A. 47
 Weiss, A. 91
 Wellhausen, J. 102
 Whittaker, M. 168
 Wiefel, W. 94
 Wieseler, K. 108
 Wilcken, U. 75
 Williamson, H.G.M. 6, 14
 Wilrich, H. 36, 75, 78, 86, 200
 Winter, P. 16, 65, 128
 Wintermute, O.S. 119
 Wirgin, W. xi
 Wirszubski, Ch. 90
 Woolley, C.L. 41
 Wutz, F. 192
- Yadin, Y. 128
 Yankelevitch, R. 114–115
- Zeitlin, S. 200
 Zielinski, T. 100–101

